

Application No. 09/648,830

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons which follow.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1-15 were pending in this application. Claims 1-15 were rejected. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. Claims 16-20 have been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-15 are now pending in this application.

Claims 16-20 have been added. Claims 16-20 are restatements of dependent claims previously dependent on Claim 8. No new matter has been added. Entry and consideration of new Claims 16-20 is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,151,001 to Anderson et al. (hereinafter Anderson et al.) The Examiner stated that Anderson et al. teach "altering the pixel such that the driver signals are altered to move the image one the matrix in manner which is undetectable to viewers." Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

Anderson et al., as cited by the Examiner, describes "patterns, one of mostly on cells and one of mostly off, which when sequentially updated appear to move in space--the eye can follow the diagonal bars. In FIG. 6b the patterns are "mixed up" in space by reversing three space bits. In FIG. 6c the mixing is more complex utilizing exclusive OR in conjunction with reversing. In this way it is arranged so that there is no pattern for the eye to follow." (Anderson et al., Col. 5, Line 67 to Col. 6 Line 7)

In contrast, Claims 1, 8 and 15 recite substantially continuously moving the static image on the matrix in a manner which is substantially undetectable to viewers of the display device.

Application No. 09/648,830

Anderson et al. does not describe moving a static image on a matrix. The patterns described by Anderson et al. are "pulsing patterns of a digital image ... having unexpected patterns or moving portions" and not static images. (Anderson, Col. 3, Lines 7-8) Accordingly, Anderson et al. does not show every element of Claims 1, 8 and 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 8 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 5-7 depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations thereof. Claims 10 and 12-14 depend from Claim 8 and include all of the limitations thereof. Accordingly, these claims are allowable for at least the reasons described above with reference to Claims 1, 8 and 15. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 3, 5-7, 10 and 12-14 is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Claims 2, 4, 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,096 to Hill, Jr. (hereinafter Hill, Jr.) Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As stated above, Anderson et al. does not show substantially continuously moving the static image on the matrix in a manner which is substantially undetectable to viewers of the display device. Anderson et al. also does not teach or suggest substantially continuously moving the static image on the matrix in a manner which is substantially undetectable to viewers of the display device. Hill Jr. fails to correct the deficiencies noted above with reference to Anderson et al.

Further, Anderson et al. is non-analogous art that teaches away from substantially continuously moving the static image on the matrix in a manner which is substantially undetectable to viewers of the display device. Anderson et al. describes minimizing false image artifacts, described as a pyschovisual phenomena. (Anderson et al., Col. 3, Lines 6-7) The present invention relates to luminance decay of emissive elements. Minimizing pyschovisual phenomena would not suggest itself to a person faced with reducing luminance decay.

Application No. 09/648,830

Further, Anderson et al. teaches that "a problem with all of the aforementioned digital techniques is the occurrence of flickering, surface streaming, line crawl, contouring, and/or color change artifacts ... these artifacts are due to the ability of the human eye to detect motion and patterns." (Anderson et al., Col 2, Lines 46-52) Anderson et al. teaches away from allowing the human eye to detect motion and patterns. Accordingly, Anderson et al. is not properly combinable with Hill, Jr. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2, 4, 9 and 11 is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Application No. 09/648,830

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 7, 2003

By Kyle Epple

Rockwell Collins, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
400 Collins Road NE M/S 124-323
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone: (319) 295-8280
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777
Customer No.: 26383

Kyle Epple
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,155